

of variance, each supported by long usage and arguments worthy of consideration.

Dr. Hanson's concluding statement pointing out the latitude in details and the agreement in entry form essential to true cooperation is worthy of profound consideration by catalogers, administrators, and teachers of cataloging whose tithing of mint and cumin too often has defeated their own admirable purposes.

It is to be sincerely hoped that Dr. Hanson's remoter purpose, increasing harmony of catalog practice throughout the world, may be served as well as the revision of the *American Rules*. So modestly presented and so scholarly a contribution will surely invite the favorable consideration of foreign bibliographers.—*Jeannette Murphy Lynn, Vanderbilt University, Nashville.*

*Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook*. No.

8. American Library Association. Catalog Section. American Library Association, 1940. 152p. \$2.25.

THOUGH THE articles included in the eighth *Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook* are too numerous to mention individually, the sketch of Charles H. Hastings and his work in the Library of Congress card division, and the two articles, one by and one about the late Dorcas Fellows, will be of particular interest.

Two groups of articles, one on the question of union catalogs and one on the division of the catalog, are particularly timely. Are union catalogs really answering a felt need; are there additional services which union catalogs should perform; are union catalogs demanding an amount of effort in their mere physical upkeep disproportionate to their value? These questions are discussed in two articles, the general conclusion being that

those who have union catalogs should endeavor continually to improve and utilize all of their potential services, and that those contemplating installing new ones should consider every angle carefully before deciding the scope and essential functions of their tool.

Ably discussed in four articles are the questions: Shall the catalog, which in many large institutions is fast outgrowing its quarters or taking on such gargantuan proportions as to frighten the timid, uninitiated user, be divided into two or three parts? In the catalog divided into two or three parts, is there not danger, due to the necessary duplication of many entries, of each part becoming in turn an unmanageable dictionary catalog? Shall the catalog be divided by dates? Shall it be greatly simplified and kept together? That the day of reckoning has come for the large catalog, and that its fate rests with the future and individual institutions are the conclusions reached.

The papers presented indicate within the ranks of catalogers a resourcefulness and initiative which speaks well for the future. Far from being an unimaginative, routine-minded group, the unenviable reputation which catalogers have in the past held with some other branches of the library profession, they seem to be about to take on the characteristics of the ancient Athenians who "spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell, or to hear some new thing." Concerning these "new things," catalogers are showing not only a willingness but an eagerness to make changes in routines which have become stumbling blocks and to undertake any task no matter how grueling the details, so long as it will bear as its fruit a better service to the library public.—*Frances L. Yocom, Fisk University, Nashville.*